

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,413	02	2/15/2002	Thurein M. Htoo	800189-11 (6829-60483)	3281
;	7590	08/18/2003			
Carpenter & Kulas, L L P 1900 Embarcadero Road Suite 109			EXAMINER		
				RINEHART, KENNETH	
Palo Alto, CA	94303			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
				3749	Q
				DATE MAILED: 08/18/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/077,413	HTOO ET AL.	
·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth B Rinehart	3749	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address -	•
THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to ch places the applicatior	a n in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date or	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension the final Office action; or (2) as	fee under set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);		
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simpli	ifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3.⊠ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s): See Continuation Sheet	•	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			endment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which were ne	wly
 7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w 			an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>19-24,27-29,51-54 and 57-61</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>6-8,12,15,33-35 and 45-48</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, 25, 26, 36</u>	0-32, 36-44, 49-50, 55-56.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:			
		Kenneth Rinehart Patent Examiner	

Application/Control Number: 10/077,413

Art Unit: 3749

The applicant's arguments have overcome the 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 19-24, 27-29, 51-54, 60, 61. Regarding applicant's arguments concerning the term Juxtaposed. This term also means nearby. Given the claim its broadest reasonable interpretation the Rits reference reads on the claim language. Regarding applicant's arguments concerning the query. The Rits reference does not teach two filters with one made of steel and the other rubber, but two filters made of PVDF or PTFE, and nylon. Consequently, the applicant's argument is not pertinent. Regarding the applicants argument concerning the 35 USC 112 rejection of claim 30, the examiner does not believe the language "filter 34 would typically move or flex toward or against filter 36 and figures 6 and 7 support the a finding of fact that the filter has a flexed structure and that there is no absorbing material positioned between the two filters. Regarding the last item concerning claim 37, air is located between the two filters and this is an absorbing material.